THE UNIVERSITY of York

Discussion Papers in Economics

No. 2002/01

Family-Friendly Work Practices in Britain: Availability and Awareness

by

John Budd and Karen Mumford

Department of Economics and Related Studies
University of York
Heslington
York, YO10 5DD

Comments Welcome.

Family-Friendly Work Practices in Britain: Availability and Awareness.

John Budd and Karen Mumford

Industrial Relations Center
University of Minnesota
jbudd@csom.umn.edu

Department of Economics
University of York
kam9@york.ac.uk

December, 2001.

JEL Classification: J13, J32, J70.

Abstract.

We use linked data on over 20,000 individuals and almost 1,500 workplaces from the Workplace Employee Relations Survey 1998 to analyze the perceived and actual availability of six major family-friendly work practices amongst British employees. We find a low base rate of actual availability, a lower rate of perceived availability, and evidence that accurate awareness of availability is further limited. We identify a range of individual worker and workplaces characteristics that are associated with greater perceived availability and typically also to awareness.

Acknowledgements
The authors acknowledge the Department of Trade and Industry, the Economic and Social Research Council, the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service, and the Policy Studies Institute as the originators of the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey data, and the Data Archive at the University of Essex as the distributor of the data. None of these organisations bear any responsibility for the authors' analysis and interpretation of the data. Financial support and aid for Karen Mumford was supplied from a Summer Placement in Whitehall 2001, their help is gratefully acknowledged as is the advice of Peter N Smith.

> 'Families are the core of our society, but they are under pressure. Women and men struggle with choices over work and family responsibilities...The Government is pledged to support families and children...We want to encourage more family-friendly employment...'
> (Tony Blair, Prime Minister, 1998).

1. Introduction.

Pressures for the introduction of family-friendly practices in the UK are coming from many directions. Changes in the labour supply of women and the greater sharing of household non-labour market work across parents have led to an increased demand from workers (male and female) for family-friendly work life balance practices. Increasing numbers of elderly people in the population has increased the need for elder care, further strengthening this demand (Department of Trade and Industry, 2001a). The families concerned cover the full socio-economic spectrum.

From political quarters, there has been increased action at the European Union level pressing Member States to introduce legislation and foster policies which aim to reconcile work and family life. These efforts are intended to promote not only gender equality in the workplace but also greater quality care for children and dependents (Caracciolo, 2001). Moreover, there are pressures to encourage families in poverty to increase their labour market participation by linking welfare programmes to some measure of hours worked.[1] The British Government has introduced and strengthened labour market oriented policies for poor families (Blundell *et al.,* 1998; Blundell and Hoynes, 2001). Questions abound, however, as to whether these welfare-to-work programmes can be effective without strong family-friendly policies in the workplace.

As a consequence, the Government has adopted a multi-pronged approach to encouraging family-friendly work environments which include the National Childcare Strategy, extended maternity and paternity entitlements, the minimum wage, the New Deal for Lone Parents, and the new Working Families Tax Credit. The major plank in the Government's programme, however, is the Work-Life Balance campaign. This campaign includes a large scale public awareness component: producing and distributing information to individuals and firms concerning their legal obligations, ways family-friendly practices can be implemented, and the potential gains from doing so.

---

[1] Britain is not alone in this regard as many of the developed countries of the world have actively linked welfare programmes to working (Blank, 2001; Elwood, 2000; Meyer and Rosenbaum, 2001). This trend has been especially strong in the latter part of the 1990s.

Perhaps aided by these governmental programmes, firms are increasingly aware that there may be advantages to implementing family-friendly policies including retaining and attracting staff, increasing morale, lowering absenteeism and raising productivity. Typically using a case study approach, several studies in Britain have found net gains for firms who have introduced these practices (surveys are provided in Dex and Scheibl, 1999; DfEE, 2000a; Forth *et al.*, 1996).

It is generally assumed that the individual employee also gains from the availability of these policies (Department of Trade and Industry, 2001b). It is not clear, however, that all workers have equal access to such programmes. Studies for the US reveal that women in high paid managerial and professional employment are more likely to have access to family-friendly policies than are lower paid, lower skilled females (Deitch and Huffman, 2000). It is important that family-friendly benefits are also available to those employees at the lowest end of the income scale. Indeed, the effectiveness of the Government's anti-poverty programme may be impaired if parents cannot find family-friendly employment: helping parents to find better jobs through training and search assistance will be of little long term benefit if constraints such as child care issues, flexibility to care for a sick child or attend a parent-teacher meeting, etc, cannot be catered for in the employment relationship.

In addition to lack of availability, there are potentially problems with awareness. Some employees who are in fact entitled to specific family-friendly policies are ignorant about their options and report that they do not have family-friendly policies available to them. For example, in the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey, in workplaces in which managers report that at least some non-managerial employees are entitled to parental leave, only 37 percent of full-time, permanent, non-managerial employees indicate that they are entitled to parental leave.

In spite of the pressures for increased family-friendly workplaces in Britain, previous research on this topic has been limited to case studies of model programmes at specific organisations and to surveys of organisations (Dex and Scheibl, 2001; Forth *et al.*, 1996; Hogarth *et al.*, 2001). In this paper we make use of new linked workplace and employee data from the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey (WERS98) which enables us to consider (a) what types of individuals are more likely to perceive that a family-friendly practice is available to them at their workplace; (b) which workplaces are more likely to actually offer family-friendly practices to British employees; and (c) what types of individuals are more likely to be accurately aware of this actual availability. With these

unique data, we are therefore able to analyse the key issues of availability and awareness, from an independent as well as an interactive perspective.

2. Measures of family friendliness.

In the postwar period, work policies and benefits were often shaped by the norms of an 'ideal' worker who worked full-time and left unpaid household work to someone else (Williams, 2000). Consequently, family-friendly corporate policies can be divided into two categories (Bailyn, 1993; Bailyn *et al.*, 2001; Drago *et al.*, 2001). One category provides services such as subsidised or on-site day care, sick-child care services, employee assistance programmes, and on-site meal preparation to help employees fulfill the standards of the ideal worker. The other category is comprised of benefits that allow employees flexibility to deviate from the model of the ideal worker to better balance work and family concerns.

One major dimension of this second category of work life balance benefits is leave polices. In Britain, there is an explicit distinction between maternity leave (a woman taking leave to give birth and care for a newborn child), paternity leave (a father taking leave around the birth of a new child), and parental leave (leave for the purpose of taking care of a child). Currently, all pregnant employees are entitled to 18 weeks of maternity leave and women who have completed one year of service with their employer are able to take additional maternity leave. Moreover, male and female employees are entitled to 13 weeks of unpaid parental leave to be used over the first five years of the child's life. Paternity leave, although not a current statutory entitlement, is scheduled to take effect in 2003. Recent proposals in the Employment Bill (DTI, 2001c) would increase ordinary maternity leave (paid) to 26 weeks and additional maternity leave (unpaid) to 26 weeks; paternity leave to two weeks (paid); and parental leave for parents of disabled children to 18 weeks. Employers, however, can choose to offer more generous benefits, in both compensation and time allowed off, and these additional leave policies are an important category of employer-sponsored family-friendly policies. Surveying for WERS98 took place prior to the changes brought in under the Employment Relations Act 1999, when maternity leave entitlement was 14 weeks, with women required to serve two years service in order to qualify for additional maternity leave, and paternity leave was not a statutory entitlement.

A second dimension of family-friendly policies that allow deviations from the ideal worker norm includes those that change the regular work schedule. One major example in this category is job sharing initiatives in which (typically) two employees work part-time to share the responsibilities and

total hours of one full-time position. Allowing workers to choose to work part-time in the absence of a formal job-sharing arrangement is another example. Other policies in this category are flexible working schedules in which workers have greater control over when they put in their hours each week at work. Another class of family-friendly policies comprises those policies that allow workers to telecommute and work from home[2].

A variety of important research issues emerge from these family-friendly practices. Are these practices utilised by individual employees and are they effective (Haley, Perry-Jenkins, and Armenia, 2001; Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness, 1999; Waldfogel, 1998)? Are employees willing to pay for them (Drago *et al.*, 2001)? Should they be mandated as a matter of public policy (Heymann, 2000)? Are these policies sufficient by themselves to reconcile the conflicts of increased demands at both work and home (Bailyn, 1993)? And, when are these policies adopted (Bardoel *et al.*, 1999; Deitch and Huffman, 2001; Osterman, 1995)? It is this last question that is the focus of this paper. The most recent UK paper addressing this issue is Dex and Scheibl (2001). Our study complements their case study approach by analysing the determinants of adoption in a broader econometric approach and by raising the important, and overlooked, problem of awareness.

3. Data.

3.1. The data set.

The data used in this study are drawn from the British Workplace Employee Relations Survey 1998 (WERS98)[3]. WERS98 is the largest, currently available, survey of its type and was conducted between October 1997 and June 1998 (Cully *et al.*, 1998). It is the fourth in an on-going series of nationally representative surveys but the first to include an employee survey.

Interviews for WERS98 were conducted with a manager (with day-to-day responsibility for employee relations) and with a worker representative (if nominated) at 2191 workplaces (all of which had more than 10 employees). Moreover, 25 employees from 1,880 of these workplaces (or all of the

[2]Recent proposals from the Work and Parents Taskforce (2001) would allow parents a statutory right to request to work flexible hours and employers a statutory duty to consider these requests seriously (Bain, 2001). Early responses indicate that the Government is favourable towards these recommendations (DTI, 2001d).

[3]Department of Trade and Industry (1999). Workplace Employee Relations Survey: Cross-Section, 1998 (computer file). 4th ed. Colchester: The Data Archive (distributor), 22 December 1999. SN: 3955.

employees in workplace with fewer than 25 employees) were randomly selected and asked to complete an employee questionnaire which resulted in over 28,000 completed questionnaires. The response rates were 80% for the face-to-face workplace interviews and 64% for the employee questionnaire. All of these returned surveys are fully linkable.

WERS98 was released in 1999. To the best of our knowledge there have been, so far, no studies of family-friendly work practices using this (or earlier versions of this) data set. There have been a limited number of studies of related issues using earlier versions of the WERS data set (Millward *et al.*, 1999) or smaller cross sectional studies (Bevan *et al.*, 1999; Dex and Scheibl, 2001; Forth *et al.*, 1996; Hogarth *et al.*, 2001). However, the linkable employee surveys add a major, and very valuable, component to these existing studies.

4. Conceptual framework.

There are a range of alternative explanations available in the literature as to why employers might choose to establish family-friendly practices in their work places (Wood, 1999). For the purposes of the present analysis, it is useful to group these explanations into three groups or theories: neoclassical economics, internal labour markets, and institutional (or neoinstitutional).

The neoclassical economics explanations of employer-provided benefits focus on employer decision-making in spot labour markets. The use of non-pecuniary benefits as a tool to attract employees is well documented in the labour supply literature (Killingsworth, 1983). Economic theory suggests that firms will introduce family-friendly policies if they increase profits either via an increase in productivity or by lowering the costs associated with higher wages or higher turnover and/or absenteeism (Department of Trade and Industry, 2001b, page 8; Glass and Fujimoto, 1995). The firm has a range of non-pecuniary benefits that it can introduce, it would only choose to offer family-friendly benefits if it thought that there was a sufficient level of demand amongst its current and potential employees (Guthrie and Roth, 1999).

In this theory, changes such as increases in the labour supply of women and the division of

household non-labour market work across parents has led to an increased demand from workers (male and female) for family-friendly practices. Nevertheless, this demand appears to be stronger amongst female employees (Bardoel *et al.*, 1999) and we would expect a positive relationship between workplaces with a large proportion of female employees and the presence of these benefits (Guthrie and Roth, 1999), although it is not clear that women of different occupations and income levels rank the array of possible family-friendly benefits equally (Ingrams and Simons, 1995; Kelly and Dobbin, 1999).

Internal labour market explanations of employer-provided benefits stem from employers' need to develop employee commitment. Firms invest in workers and they want workers to invest in firm-specific human capital and have high levels of commitment. Thus, Osterman (1995) argues, firms provide non-pecuniary benefits such as family-friendly practices when they face difficulties employing high quality workers into work tasks that require high levels of commitment and non-supervised performance (Doeringer and Piore, 1971). Empirically, this implies that measures of internal labour market and high commitment work systems, such as the presence of training, longer tenure levels, higher general education levels, job ladders, work teams, and employee seniority will be important.

In contrast, institutional theories emphasise that organisations respond not only to economic factors, but also to the institutional environment (Guthrie and Ross, 1999; Kelly and Dobbin, 1999). In this model, firms are essentially pressured into adopting family-friendly policies by various institutions including trade unions. Unionisation of a work group can bring about two important changes in the workplace. One, to the extent that the right to strike results in collective bargaining power that is greater than individual, labour's bargaining power will increase. This increased bargaining power might allow unions to negotiate family-friendly policies. Two, union representation can change the nature of workplace decision-making from a neoclassical focus on the marginal employee to a median-voter model with a focus on average preferences (Freeman and Medoff, 1984). If the average worker has a greater preference for family-friendly policies than the marginal worker, unionised workplaces will have a greater frequency of family-friendly policies.

5. Variable description.

Based on these theories, we empirically model the availability of family-friendly work practices by incorporating a range of variables capturing both the characteristics of the individual employees and those of the workplace they are employed in. These variables can be considered in groupings, beginning with the indicators of the family-friendly work practices. For the individual employee data, the additional groups are: demographic characteristics; job characteristics; education; and occupation. At the workplace level, the variables are grouped according to basic workplace characteristics; workplace demographics; workplace pay; workplace say; workplace employment dynamics; and industry.

5.1 Indicators of family-friendly practices.

The indicators of a family-friendly practice used in this study incorporate examples of both categories of family-friendly policies discussed in section 2 above, they are:

1. parental leave;
2. working at or from home in normal working hours;
3. a workplace nursery or help with the cost of child care;
4. flexible working hours (flexi-time);
5. job sharing (sharing a full time job with someone else);
6. paid leave at short notice.

For the first five measures employees were asked 'if you personally needed any of these arrangements, would they be available at this workplace?' For the sixth measure respondents were asked 'if you needed to take a day off work at short notice, for example to look after a sick family member, how would you usually do it?

It should be noted that employees are asked if the policy is available to them. Thus, the reported responses are measuring perceived availability which might be different from actual availability, since employees may not know that a practice is available to them. We would expect that parents would be more aware of the availability of family-friendly policies: they have the greatest incentive to pay attention to the provision of these practices in their workplace; they are perhaps more likely to be

informed of these policies by their employer; and they are more likely to be a member of a social group where others are making use of such provisions. This effect may be stronger for coupled parents than lone parents, especially if a minimum resource level is required to take advantage of a practice being available.

Table 1 provides the weighted[4] means and standard errors of the family-friendly measures for the full sample (representing the British population of workers at workplaces with at least 10 employees, hereafter called the population). Paid leave is the most commonly available practice with 45% of the whole sample believing this would be available to them. The next most common policies are flexi time (33%) and parental leave (27%). The perceived availability of job sharing is lower at 16% for the population. Only 9% of the population have home working available, whilst subsidised child care is rare with a total population rate of 4%.

In the case of each practice, the majority of employees do not believe it would available to them if they needed it. Indeed, it is more common for two thirds or more of the employees to think a given practice would not be provided to them. One in three employees respond that none of these policies are available to them and 40% of employees believe that only one policy is available.[5] This is a low base rate of perceived availability across the sampled population.

5.2 Individual characteristics.

For the individual employee data the explanatory variables are grouped according to: demographic characteristics; job characteristics; and education.

Demographic variables reflect the needs of the employees and their potential demand for work

[4]The need to weight survey sample data, such as WERS98, is discussed in Deaton (1998); Forth and Kirby (2000); Airey *et al.*, (1999); and Purdon and Pickering (2001).

[5]If we compare these results with the answers provided from the workplace responses, 18% of workplaces do not have at least one of these family-friendly policies available (with the exception of flexi time measures which are not included in the workplace survey) and 31% of workplaces offer only one policy. We will return to discuss this issue in section 7 below.

life balance practices. The demographic characteristics included are the age of the employee; gender; presence of a dependent child below 5; dependent child aged 5-11; dependent child aged 12 to 18; and non-white racial status (ethnic). The average age in the population is 39.5 years and 49% of the population are female. Less than half of the population have a dependent child living with them (42%). At 70% most of the population are coupled (married or cohabiting), 88% of the parents are. Thus 12% of parents are single parents, or 5% of the entire population. The distribution of children is evenly spread across the child age bands. Non-whites make up some 3.6% of the population and 4.2% of all parents.

The *job characteristics* of the individual employees are captured in their normal hourly wage; usual hours worked; tenure in current job; training provided by the employer in last 12 months; part-time status (less than 30 hours per week); fixed-term contract; temporary contract; if they are currently a union member; and occupation. The average person earns £7.20 per hour, they work for 35.6 hours per work, and have an average tenure in their current job of 5.3 years. One in four employees have had access to employer provided training schemes in the previous twelve months. One in four are working part time, 2% are on fixed-term contracts, and 39% are union members. We also include 9 occupation categories (the finest division possible given the data). The *education* measures reveal that 64% of the population did not progress beyond the completion of high school (a-level or equivalent) and only 21% advanced to complete tertiary studies, although 37% of the population have acquired vocational qualifications.

5.3 Workplace characteristics.

We include a range of workplace variables which are grouped according to basic workplace characteristics; workplace demographics; workplace pay; workplace say; workplace employment dynamics; and industry.

Beginning with *basic workplace characteristics*: workplace size (number of employees on the pay roll 12 months previously), the age of the workplace(in years); whether or not the workplace is part of a multi-enterprise establishment; and if the workplace operates a formal training scheme. British

workplaces have on average 645 employees, they are 39 years old, the majority (76%) are part of a multiple workplace establishment and close to one in two have a formal training programme in place.

The *workplace demographic* measures include the proportion of the workforce female; proportion working part-time (less than 30 hours per week); proportion who are youths (less than 21 years old); the proportion who are 'old' (aged over 50 years); and the proportion with non-white ethnic status. The average workplace demographics reflect those for the individual employees, they are included as control variables but also because they allow us to consider if there is apparent segregation happening at the workplace level. By including individual and workplace demographics we can more fully explore these relationships in our regression analysis.

We include three measures of *workplace pay*; the average full time workplace wage, if age and years of service (seniority) affect the full time workplace wage; and if job grade/classification affect the full time wage. The average workplace hourly wage is £7.26, one in two workplaces use seniority in their reward system, and one in three reward grade.

We include seven indicators of the scope for *workplace say*: the proportion of employees working in formally designated teams (69%); the proportion of non-managerial employees in quality circles (22%); workplaces where individuals have a lot of discretion over their work (22%); workplaces where individuals have some discretion over their work (45%); if a union is recognised in negotiation procedures (61%); whether or not there is a group grievance procedure (66%); and is the survey respondent a human resources or personnel manager (49% of workplaces).

There are four measures of relative *workplace employment dynamics*: employment change; dismissals; resignations; and difficulties filling vacancies in the workplace. Total employment change in the workplaces averages 6%, with a 1% dismissal rate, and a 14% resignation rate. Perhaps surprisingly, workplaces reported difficulties filling almost a quarter of their job vacancies. A range of 12 *industry* measures are also included, these follow the standard industry classification definitions.

6. Individual employee's perceived availability.

We implement probit analyses for each of our six measures of the individual employee's perception that a family-friendly work practice would be available to them at their workplace using the fully weighted data set (Greene, 1997), results are presented in Table 2. The overall test of the explanatory power of the regressors is clearly significant for all the regressions and whilst the pseudo R^2 measures are not high, they are comparable with those found in other similar studies. Overall, the estimates are generally well defined and of the expected sign.

The estimated marginal effect (or differential effects for binary variables) are reported in Table 2. Evaluating variables at their sample means, the marginal effects are calculated as the change in the probability for a small change in the independent continuous variable (or for a discrete one unit change in the dummy, binary, variables). For example, in column 1, a small increase in the average age of the employee would result in a 0.010 percentage point fall in the probability of parental leave being available (from 0.267 to 0.257), or a drop of 3.8%. The calculation is similar for dummy variables. A female employee is 0.077 percentage points more likely to report that parental leave is available, and relative to the weighted sample mean of 0.267, this point estimate implies an increase of 28.8% in the probability that the employee responds that parental leave is available at their workplace(from 26.7% to 34.4%). A single asterisk indicates significance at 90% confidence, two asterisks indicate significance at 95% confidence. We now consider the results in more detail.

The first five independent variables are a series of dummy variables capturing the parental and coupling status of the individual employees, the omitted variable is coupled (married or cohabiting) parents. We find that whilst individual employees with no children (single or coupled) are less likely to believe parental leave is available to them than are coupled parents, there is no significant difference (at the 95% confidence level) for single parents with children in any of the three age bands for all of the six dependent variables considered (Budd and Mumford, 2001a).

Of the remaining explanatory variables, the first of those that have a significant impact on four or more of the family-friendly measures is being a female (which has a positive impact on the

probability of parental leave, child care and job sharing whilst negatively impacting on paid leave and home working). The other demographic variable that impacts on four or more measures is being ethnic (non-white status).

Of the job characteristics of the individual employee, working more hours is associated with greater probability of availability; as is tenure; and recent training. Being a union member has a positive impact on parental leave and job sharing and a negative impact on flexi time and home working.

Higher education levels are associated with greater probability of availability, particularly so for post-graduates who are more likely to believe that they have all forms of the family-friendly practices available to them, with the exception of paid leave. Similarly, the white collar occupations (managers, professionals, associate professionals, and clerks) appear more likely to be offered these practices.

Amongst the workplace variables, results for the basic characteristics of the workplace are mixed. Employees in larger work places report greater availability of parental leave and child care subsidies, but a lower probability of paid leave and flexi time. A multi-enterprise structure is associated with less flexi time and home working, but also less child care and more paid leave.

Of the workplace demographic variables, the proportion of females in the workplace is the only measure that impacts four or more times, it is also consistently positive leading to a greater probability of family-friendly measures being available in five out of the six measures. None of the remaining workplace variables impact significantly four or more times, with the exception of the industry dummy for education.

Our results suggest that what is important for the probability of employees to believe that they have family-friendly practices available to them is a subset of their individual demographic, job, education and occupational characteristics. The size of their workplace, if it is in a multi-enterprise

structure and the proportion of females in their work force are also important.

The selection of 'four or more' is of course entirely arbitrary. If three or more is chosen then age, hourly wage, temporary contract, proportion of youth in the workplace, having a lot of discretion, union recognition in the bargaining process, resignations, manufacturing, electrical, and wholesale and retail trades would also be included in the list of important explanatory variables.

7. The actual availability of a family-friendly practice in the workplace.

With the exception of flexible working hours, WERS98 contains both individual and workplace measures of the availability of family-friendly policies. For the workplace-level questions, the manager with day-to-day responsibilities for personnel matters was interviewed and for the family-friendly policies, this individual was asked questions very similar to the individual questions described above. The main difference in the wording between the individual questions and the workplace questions is that while the individual questions ask whether the policies are available to the individual respondent, the workplace questions ask whether the policies are available to any non-managerial employees.

We use these workplace-level responses as an indication of actual availability, in contrast to the individual-level measures which indicate perceived availability. To analyze actual availability we estimate the same probit models as reported in Table 2, but the dependent variable is the workplace response of actual availability. The results for these determinants of the actual availability of family-friendly practices at a workplace are presented in Table 3.

There are very few independent variables that impact on four or more measures of actual availability. Those that do are being a postgraduate (each time increasing the probability of availability); the proportion of females (positively related to availability for child-care, home working and job sharing but negatively related to paid leave); and the presence of a human resources representative (increasing the probability). Three of the industries also impact on four or more family-friendly measures; finance (consistently negatively) and health and education (both negatively except for a positive impact on paid leave). As discussed previously, we might expect increased demand for

family-friendly practices from predominantly female workplaces and perhaps less demand from older workers. A key role for a human resources representative in workplace may be as an advocate in terms of increasing availability and so we might also expect this positive relationship (we will return to this issue in section 8 below).

Considering those independent variables which have a significant impact on three or measures of actual availability extends the list to include: recent training (positive impact); being a union member (positive relationship with parental leave and job sharing whilst negatively related to child care provision); workplace training (positive); workplaces that have quality circles in place (positive); manufacturing (negative); and hotels (negative).

In terms of the theories presented in section 4, there is only modest support for each of them. For the neoclassical theory which predicts that family-friendly policies reflect labour market supply and demand pressures, the demographic variables, especially fraction female, are significant in several of the models. The employment dynamics variables which are intended to capture labour market tightness, however, are not strong predictors of these family-friendly policies. For the internal labour market theory, the presence of training and quality circles increase the likelihood of offering parental leave. On the other hand, workplaces which provide employees with a lot of discretion are less likely to have paid leave and job sharing policies which does not support the internal labour market explanation. Lastly, union representation and the presence of a human resources representative are both positively associated with several of the policies which is consistent with the institutional theory.

We find that the inclusion of the individual variables had little significant impact on actual availability at the workplace found in Table 3[6]. Furthermore, comparing the workplace independent variables found to have a significant impact on both perceived and actual availability (see Tables 2 and 3) suggests a higher marginal effect in the actual availability regressions. This suggests that workplace characteristics are more important at predicting actual availability.

[6]As an indication of relative goodness of fit, the pseudo R squared measures for regressions of actual availability excluding the measures of individual characteristics are very similar to those reported in Table 3: 0.1616, 0.1272, 0.2674, 0.1640 and 0.3059 respectively.

8. The awareness of the availability of family-friendly policies.

The success of the Government's campaigns to increase the take up of family-friendly practices in workplaces obviously depends on employees being aware that these practices are available to them. For example, low base rate levels of perceived availability could be because the practices are not actually available at the workplace or it may be that employees simply don't know that they are available when they are.

The (weighted) mean values of the individual responses of perceived availability and those for the workplaces for actual availability are reproduced here from Table 1:

	individual perceived availability	workplace availability
parental leave	0.272	0.441
home work	0.092	0.184
job share	0.159	0.399
paid leave	0.452	0.131
child care	0.040	0.131

Workplace respondents are considerably more likely to say that a family-friendly practice is available. These differences suggest that a lack of awareness amongst employees.

Table 4 presents results from five probit models which include all of the previously discussed individual and workplace-level control variables (see Tables 2 and 3) , however, the sample is now restricted to only those individuals whose workplace had the policy in place. The dependent variable is, therefore, the individual's response to the family-friendly question in the employee survey conditional on the management response being that the practice was available. If all individuals have the policy available, then the estimated coefficients reflect differences in knowledge about the availability of the policy – information, not actual availability[7].

[7]There is a possible complication. The workplace-level measure captures whether any non-managerial employees have this policy available, not whether all non-managerial employees have this policy available. To address this, we considered excluding those workplaces in which three other fringe benefits (pension plan, extra sick leave, and four or more weeks paid leave) are not provided to both managers and the largest occupational group. This is an attempt to omit workplaces in which fringe benefits are unequally available. We found no significant difference between these results and the more general results presented in Table 4.

Considering Table 4 in more detail, being female, working longer hours, having greater tenure, recent training, higher education levels, white collar occupations, and a higher proportions of females in the workforce female are associated with a greater tendency to a consistent response across the individual and the workplace for at least three of the five family-friendly practices. Having a higher proportion of older workers has a mixed impact (increasing the awareness of paid leave but lowering it for parental leave and child care subsidies). These results are qualitatively similar to those found in Table 2. In other words, those characteristics associated with an individual perceiving that a practice is available to them are also typically the characteristics that are associated with them being correctly aware that it is actually available. These are generally a subset of the employee's individual characteristics and the demographics of the workforce at the workplace.

There is, however, no evidence that individuals in workplaces where a practice is actually available are more likely to respond that they believe the practice is available to them. The marginal effects reported in Table 4 are not consistently higher or lower than those reported in Table 2. The lower levels of significance reported in Table 4 (even given the differences in the sample sizes), also do not indicate that workers in workplaces where a family-friendly policy is in place have better information than the population in aggregate[8].

There are two main formal information sources in workplaces: from the management side, through the human resources representative; and from organised labour, through the union. Results in Table 5 provide an indication as to how successful these information conduits are in British workplaces.

The first panel in Table 5 considers the role of the human resources representative (HRR), row one reports results for the impact of a HRR in the regression of actual availability at the workplace

[8]There is a potential selectivity issue in this analysis, by only considering workers in workplaces where practices are available we are selecting a subgroup of the population who may share similar characteristics. For example, we may be selecting workplaces from the primary sector whose workers may be more likely to be higher educated, have longer tenure, etc. This would bias our results in favour of many of the characteristics we do find to be associated with availability. We believe that such an affect would lead us to conclude that information flows are stronger amongst this group, however, rather than similar to the general population.

(Table 3). A HRR in the workplace is significantly associated with greater actual availability of all five measures of family-friendly practices in the workplace. The second row provides the impact of a HRR in the awareness regression discussed above and presented in Table 4, a HRR is only significantly associated with employees being more likely to perceive a policy is available in those workplaces saying it is actually available in the cases of parental and paid leave. Rows three and four reveal why there is this discrepancy between availability and awareness. Row three provides results where the dependent variable indicates workers as being correctly aware: individuals who believe the practice is available and who work in workplaces who say it is available. Row four provides similar results for those workers who say the practice is not available but whose workplaces say it is (these workers are unaware). In four out of five of the family-friendly measures, the presence of a HRR in a workplace is positively and significantly associated with some workers being correctly aware and significant numbers of workers who are unaware. In other words, there is no clear evidence that a HRR increases consistent information of availability to workers.

Panel two of Table 5 carries out a similar exercise for workplaces where a union is recognised, such workplaces are more likely to have parental leave, child care subsidies and job sharing available (row five). Workers in these workplaces are more likely to be correctly aware that these policies are available to them (row seven), however, there are still a significant number (although at lower confidence levels) who are unaware of this availability (row eight). These results suggest that workplaces with union recognition are providing better information flows than is the HRR, but there are still significant numbers of uninformed workers[9].

9. Conclusion.

Problems of balancing work-life conflicts are a major current policy concern and the active focus of much research. Recent Government policies to increase the participation of parents in the

[9]An alternative explanation to limited information flows generating these results may be differential access to the family-friendly measures across employees in the same workplace. For example, we cannot rule out the argument that the results in panel two of Table 5 reflect differential availability of these policies between unionised and nonunion employees within a specific workplace. But to the extent that they do not reflect this possibility, the results imply that unionised employees have better information about parental leave and job sharing policies (Budd and Mumford, 2001b).

labour market, the rising propensity for women to play an active role in the labour market, greater sharing of household non-labour market work across parents, and increased need for elder care have led to an increased demand from workers (male and female) for family-friendly work practices. The Government has recognised the desire, and often the need, these families have for work life balance policies.

We use linked data on over 20,000 individuals and almost 1,500 workplaces from the British Workplace Employee Relations Survey 1998 (WERS98) to analyze the perceived and actual availability of six major work life balance policies: parental leave, paid family leave, child care subsidies, flexible working hours, working at home options, and job sharing options.

We find a low base rate of perceived availability of family-friendly policies in Britain, most policies are perceived as being available to less than a third of all employees and one in three employees say that none are available to them.

We find the individual characteristics that determine the probability of an employee believing family-friendly work practices are available to them are their age, gender, ethnic status, hourly wage, hours worked, tenure, being recently involved in a training programme, having a temporary contract, being a union member, education level, and occupation. The workplace characteristics that affect this provision are workplace size, multi-enterprise establishment, proportion of females in the workplace, proportion of youths in the workforce, having a lot of discretion, union recognition in the bargaining process,, the resignation rate, and a range of industry measures.

The probability of actual availability of family-friendly practices at the workplace are less affected by the characteristics of individual employees and the demographics of the workforce. The impact of the workplace characteristics are instead more important, especially those of workplace size; the proportion of the workforce female; the presence of quality circles; the presence of a human resources representative; and a range of industry measures.

We also find evidence of limited awareness amongst workers of the actual availability of family-friendly measures in their workplaces. Those characteristics associated with greater perceived availability are also found to be linked with greater awareness of actual availability: they are mainly a subset of individual characteristics and workforce demographics. There are, however, many workers who do not appear to know that a practice is available to them at their workplace when it is.

The main institutional information sources of a human resource representative or union have limited effect on these information flows in workplaces. Employees in unionised workplaces appear to have better information of availability than those in nonunionised workplaces although there are still significant numbers of unaware employees. The presence of a human resources representative in a workplace, however, has little impact on increased awareness. These results suggest a need for the provision of information to workers in the Government's Work Life Balance Programme.

10. References.

Airey, C. Hales, J. Hamilton, R. McKernan, A. and Purdon, S. 1999. 'The Workplace Employee Relations Survey (WERS) 1997-8: Technical Report (Cross Section and Panel Surveys).' *WERS98 Data Dissemination Service*, NIESR, London.

Bailyn, L. 1993. *Breaking the Mold: Women, Men, and Time in the New Corporate World*. New York: Free Press.

Bailyn, L., Drago,R., and Kochan, T. 2001. *Integrating Work and Family Life: A Holistic Approach*. Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Work-Family Policy Network. Retrieved October 4, 2001 from *http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/WorkFamily.pdf*.

Bain, G. 2001. 'Chairman's Foreword.' in Work and Parents Taskforce. 2001. *About Time: Flexible Working.* November 20.

Bardoel, E.A. Moss, S.A. Smyrnios, K. and Tharenou, P. 1999. 'Employee Characteristics Associated with the Provision of Work-Family Policies and Programs.' *International Journal of Manpower* 20(8); 563-576.

Bevan, S. Dench, S. Tamkin, P and Cummings, J. 1999. 'Family-Friendly Employment: the Business Case.' *Institute for Employment Studies, Research Report 136,* July.

Blair, Tony. *Statement by the Prime Minister*. May 1998. Retrieved from the DfEE website www.dfee.gov.uk/childcare/content1.htm on 26/07/00.

Blank, R.M. 2001. 'Declining Caseloads/Increased Work: What Can We Conclude About the Effects of Welfare Reform.' *Economic Policy Review* 7(2); 25-36.

Blundell, R., Duncan, A., McCrae, J. and Meghir, C. 1998. *The Labour Market Impact of the Working*

Families Tax Credit. IFS Report to the Bank of England Monetary Policy Committee, December.

Blundell, R. and Hoynes, H., 2001. 'Has "In-Work" Benefit Reform Helped the Labour Market.' *NBER Working Paper* 8546, October.

Budd, J. and Mumford, K. 2001a. 'The Relative Availability of Work Life Balance Practices to Lone Parents in Britain: Draft Report.' Prepared for the Department of Trade and Industry, October.

Budd, J. and Mumford, K. 2001b. 'Trade Unions and Family-Friendly Policies in Britain.' *University of York, Discussion Papers in Economics* 01/14, October.

Caracciolo, E. 2001. 'The Family-Friendly Workplace: The EC Position.' *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations* 17(3); 323-344.

Cully, M., A. O'Reilly, N. Millward, J. Forth, S. Woodland, G. Dix, and Bryson, A. 1998. *The 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey: First Findings.* Department of Trade and Industry.

Deaton, A. 1998. *The Analysis of Household Surveys. A Microeconometric Approach to Development Policy.* World Bank. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Deitch, C.H. and Huffman, M.L. 2001. 'Family Responsive Benefits and the Two-Tiered Labor Market.' in Hertz, R. and Marshall, N. (editors). *Working Families: The Transformation of the American Home*, Berkeley: University of California Press, CA, USA. pp. 103-130.

DfEE, Department for Education and Employment. 2000a. *Work-Life Balance*. Retrieved from the DfEE website www.dfee.gov.uk/work-lifebalance on 26/07/00.

Department of Trade and Industry. 1999. Workplace Employee Relations Survey: Cross-Section, 1998 (computer file). 4th ed. Colchester: The Data Archive (distributor), 22 December 1999. SN: 3955.

Department of Trade and Industry. 2001a. *Work Life Balance: The Business Case.* September.

Department of Trade and Industry. 2001b. *Work Life Balance: Essential Guide to Work-Life Balance.*' September.

Department of Trade and Industry. 2001c. *Employment. Work and Parents: Competitiveness and Choice*. Retrieved from the DTI website (www.dti.gov.uk/er/review on 17/12/01).

Department of Trade and Industry. 2001d. *Government Delivers for Working Parents. Press Release P/2001/645.* November 20, 2001.

Dex, S. and Scheibl, F. 1999. 'Business Performance and Family-Friendly Policies.' *Journal of General Management* 24(4); 22-37.

Dex, S. and Scheibl, F. 2001.'Flexible and Family-Friendly Working Arrangements in UK-Based SMEs: Business Cases.' *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 39(3); 411-431.

Doeringer, P. B. and Piore, M.J. 1971. *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*. D.C.Heath, Massachusetts, USA.

Drago, R, Costanza, D., Caplan, R., Brubaker, T., Cloud, D., Harris, N., Kashian, R., and Riggs, T.L. 2001. "The Willingness-to-Pay for Work/Family Policies: A Study of Teachers." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 55(1): 22-41.

Ellwood, E. 2000. 'Anti-Poverty Policy for Families in the Next Century: From Welfare to Work - and Worries.' *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14(1); 187-198.

Forth, J. Lissenburgh, S. Callender, C and Millward, N. 1996. 'Family Friendly Working Arrangements in Britain.' *Policy Studies Institute Research Report 16.*

Forth, J. and Kirby, S. 2000. 'Guide to the Analysis of the Workplace Employee Relations Survey 1998.' *WERS98 Data Dissemination Service*, NIESR, London.

Freeman, R B., and Medoff., J.L. 1984. *What Do Unions Do?* New York: Basic Books.

Glass, J. and Fujimoto, T. 1995. 'Employer Characteristics and the Provision of Family Responsive Policies.' *Work and Occupations* 22(4); 380-411.

Greene, W.H. 1997. *Econometric Analysis*. Third edition. Prentice Hall International, New Jersey.

Gregg, P., Johnson, P. and Rees, H.1999. 'Entering Work and the British Tax and Benefit System.' *IFS Report Series* R59, March.

Guthrie, D and Roth, L.M. 1999. 'The State, Courts and Maternity Policies in US Organizations: Specifying Institutional Arrangements.' *American Sociological Review* 64; 41-63.

Haley, H-L., Perry-Jenkins, M., and Armenia, A. 2001. "Workplace Policies and the Psychological Well-Being of First-time Parents." In Rosanna Hertz and Nancy L. Marshall, eds., *Working Families: The Transformation of the American Home*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 227-250.

Heymann, J. 2000. *The Widening Gap: Why America's Working Families Are in Jeopardy and What Can Be Done about It*. New York: Basic Books.

Hogarth, T., Hasluck, C., Peirre, G., with Winterbotham, M., and Vivan, D. 2001. Work-Life Balance 2000: Results From the Baseline Study.' *Research Report RR249. Department for Education and Employment.*

Ingrams, P. and Simons, T. 1995. 'Institutional and Resource Dependence Determinants of Responsiveness to Work-Family Issues.' *Academy Management Journal* 38(5); 1466-82.

Kelly, E. and Dobbin, F. 1999. 'Civil Rights Law At Work: Sex Discrimination and the Rise of Maternity Leave Policies.' *American Journal of Sociology* 105(2): 455-492.

Killingsworth, M. 1983. *Labour Supply*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK.

Meyer, B.D., and Rosenbaum, D. T. 2001. 'Welfare, the Earned Income Tax Credit and the Labor Supply of Single Mothers.' *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 66 (3); 1063-1114.

Millward, N. Woodland, S. Bryson, A. Forth, J. and Kirby, S. 1999. 'A Bibliography of Research Based on the British Workplace Industrial Relations Survey Series.' *Mimeo, National Institute for Economic and Social Research*, November.

Osterman, P. 1995. 'Work/Family Programs and the Employment Relationship.' *Administrative Science Quarterly* 40; 681-700.

Purdon, S. and Pickering, K. 2001. 'The Use of Sampling Weights in the Analysis of the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey.' *WERS98 Data Dissemination Service*, NIESR, London.

Thompson, C.A., Beauvais, L.L., and Lyness, K.S. 1999. 'When Work-Family Benefits Are Not Enough: the Influence of Work-Family Culture on Benefit Utilization, Organizational Attachment, and Work-Family Conflict.' *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(3): 392-415.

Waldfogel, J. 1998. 'The Family Gap for Young Women in the United States and Britain: Can

Maternity Leave Make a Difference?' *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16(3): 505-545.

Williams, J. 2000. *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to Do about It*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wood, S. 1999. 'Family-Friendly Management: Testing the Various Perspectives?' *National Institute Economic Review* 168: 99-116

Work and Parents Taskforce. 2001. *About Time: Flexible Working.* November 20.

Table 1. Variable means and definitions.

	mean	s. error	variable definition.
individual variables			
parental leave	0.272	0.006	parental leave would be available
home work	0.092	0.004	working at home during normal hours available
job share	0.159	0.005	job sharing available
child care	0.452	0.009	day off at short notice, paid leave available
paid leave	0.325	0.007	flexible working hours (flexi-time)
flexible times	0.040	0.004	workplace nursery or help with costs of child care available
age	39.533	0.156	midpoints of individuals age bands (7 bands)
age2	1700.6	12.415	age squared
female	0.493	0.009	are you female
married	0.690	0.005	living with spouse or partner
child04	0.139	0.004	dep child aged 0-4
child511	0.193	0.004	dep child aged 5-11
child12	0.199	0.004	dep child aged12-18
child018	0.413	0.006	dep child aged 0-18
ethnic	0.040	0.002	not white
hourly wage	7.264	0.091	gross hourly pay (12 bands)
hours	35.657	0.240	hours normally worked in a week
hours squared	1451.5	15.844	hours normally worked in a week squared
tenure	5.315	0.057	years at workplace (5 bands) max 10 years
training	2.464	0.043	employer provided job training in last 12 months
part-time	0.249	0.007	working less than 30 hours per week
fixed term	0.033	0.002	fixed term contract
temporary	0.044	0.003	employed in a temporary position
union member	0.391	0.011	union member
education other	0.261	0.006	education other
cse	0.121	0.003	CSE or equivalent, GCSE (grades D-G)
olevel	0.261	0.005	O level or equivalent
alevel	0.147	0.004	A level or equivalent
degree	0.155	0.004	degree or equivalent
postgrad	0.054	0.002	post grad degree or equivalent
vocational qual	0.373	0.005	vocational qualification
managers	0.086	0.003	managers and senior administrators
profs	0.129	0.004	professionals
assoc prof	0.089	0.004	associate professional and technical
clerk	0.159	0.005	clerical and secretarial
craft	0.104	0.005	craft and skilled service
personal	0.083	0.005	personal and protective services
sales	0.096	0.006	sales operator, sales assistant
operative	0.129	0.008	operative and assembly
other occup	0.124	0.005	other occupational group
workplace variables			
wp parental leave	0.441	0.016	parental leave available in workplace
wp home working	0.184	0.013	working at home during normal hours available in wp
wp job share	0.399	0.015	job sharing available in wp
wp paid leave	0.625	0.016	day off at short notice, paid leave available in wp
wp child care	0.131	0.012	workplace nursery or help with costs of child care available in wp
wp size	645.5	121.429	employees on pay 12 months previously
wp age	38.691	1.405	age of the current workplace

Table 1. Variable means and definitions, continued.

	mean	s. error	variable definition.
wp multi-enterprise	0.758	0.013	wp is one of multiple wps in enterprise
wp training	0.470	0.011	formal training scheme operates
wp ppn female	0.492	0.008	proportion of the workforce female
wp ppn part time	0.260	0.008	proportion of the workforce part time
wp ppn youth	0.058	0.003	proportion of the workforce below 21
wp ppn old	0.161	0.003	proportion of the workforce over 50
wp ppn ethnic	0.042	0.003	proportion of the workforce ethnic
wp ave wage	7.258	0.082	wp average full time wage
wp rew. seniority	0.501	0.016	age & years service affect full time wage
wp rew. grade	0.736	0.014	job grade/classification affect full time wage
wp teams	0.689	0.011	ppn employees in formally designated teams
wp circles	0.217	0.009	ppn non-managerial in quality circles
wp lot disc	0.222	0.014	indiv employees have a lot of discretion over work
wp some disc	0.450	0.017	indiv employees have some discretion over work
wp union recognition	0.613	0.014	union recognised in negotiation
wp grievance proc	0.658	0.014	group grievance procedure
wp hr rep	0.487	0.014	respondent is HR or personnel manager/officer
wp employment change	0.060	0.009	employment change rel. to total employment
wp dismissals	0.013	0.001	dismissals relative to total wp employment
wp resignations	0.138	0.005	resignations relative to total wp employment
wp dif. vacancies	0.246	0.010	difficulties filling vacancies
manufacturing	0.233	0.011	manufacturing
electrical	0.006	0.000	electrical
construction	0.029	0.003	construction
wholesale	0.145	0.006	wholesale
hotels	0.042	0.004	hotels
transport	0.060	0.005	transport
finance	0.040	0.003	finance
other business	0.084	0.005	other business
public	0.088	0.005	public services
education	0.104	0.005	education
health	0.134	0.007	health
other	0.033	0.003	other
number of obs	28215		
number of strata	70		
number of psu	1782		

Source: Workplace Employee Relations Survey, 1998. The point estimates account for the stratification and clustering in the sampling procedure.

Table 2. Probability of perceived availability of family friendly practices.

	parent leave	paid leave	child care	flexi time	home work	job share
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
individual variables						
single parent child 0-4	-0.020	-0.022	0.015	0.006	0.001	0.029
single parent child 5-11	0.005	-0.037	0.010	0.040	-0.000	-0.013
single parent child 12-18	0.025	0.015	-0.007*	0.046	0.002	-0.030
single no children	-0.064**	0.017	-0.005*	-0.004	-0.006	-0.002
married no children	-0.060**	0.023*	-0.008**	-0.022*	-0.002	-0.014*
age	-0.010**	0.011**	-0.001	-0.002	0.004**	-0.003
age2	0.059	-0.130**	0.004	0.047	-0.037**	0.029
female	0.077**	-0.030**	0.007**	0.019	-0.008**	0.039**
ethnic	-0.059**	-0.006	-0.008**	0.057*	-0.012*	0.017
hourly wage	0.002*	0.003	0.000	-0.003**	0.001**	0.001
hours	0.005**	0.019**	0.001*	-0.001	0.001*	0.005**
hours squared	-0.000**	-0.000**	-0.000**	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000**
tenure	0.004**	0.005**	0.001**	0.000	0.001	0.002**
training	0.008**	0.001	0.000	0.012**	0.003**	0.005**
part-time	-0.019	0.000	0.002	0.030	0.013	0.036**
fixed term	-0.033	-0.105**	-0.002	-0.035	0.001	-0.027**
temporary	-0.021	-0.156**	0.001	0.043*	-0.006	0.028*
union member	0.029**	0.021	-0.000	-0.048**	-0.019**	0.016**
education other	-0.068**	-0.010	-0.002	0.022	-0.007	-0.032**
cse	-0.056**	0.005	0.008	0.015	0.002	-0.019*
alevel	0.014	0.023	0.002	0.039**	0.021**	0.017*
degree	0.011	-0.012	0.005	0.050**	0.036**	0.031**
post graduate	0.086**	-0.018	0.016**	0.126**	0.074**	0.058**
vocational qualification	-0.012	-0.002	0.003	-0.014	-0.008**	-0.007
managers	0.088**	-0.020	0.024**	0.180**	0.283**	0.084**
profs	0.023	-0.038	0.017**	0.080**	0.163**	0.055**
assoc prof	0.021	-0.030	0.016**	0.141**	0.142**	0.027**
clerk	0.021	0.093**	0.017**	0.151**	0.085**	0.098*
craft	-0.013	0.001	0.005	0.054*	0.036*	-0.002
personal	0.057**	-0.060**	0.010	-0.025	0.039**	0.015
sales	0.049*	-0.034	0.008	0.063**	0.162**	-0.002
operative	0.028	-0.076**	0.009	0.043	-0.017	0.017
workplace variables						
wp size	0.013**	-0.009	0.003**	-0.014**	-0.007**	0.005
wp age	0.017	0.103	-0.027	-0.559**	-0.212**	0.017
wp multi-enterprise	-0.008	0.058**	-0.014**	-0.042**	-0.016**	-0.008
wp training	0.007	0.056**	-0.002	-0.033	-0.002	0.018
wp ppn female	0.111**	-0.009	0.017*	0.181**	0.024*	0.145**
wp ppn part time	-0.012	-0.167**	-0.000	-0.092*	-0.011	-0.027
wp ppn youth	0.031	-0.397**	0.015	0.228**	-0.109**	0.027
wp ppn old	-0.105**	0.002	-0.015	0.024	0.013	-0.001
wp ppn ethnic	0.091	0.022	0.035**	0.022	0.027	-0.019
wp ave wage	0.002	0.013**	0.001	0.003	0.001	0.003*
wp rew. seniority	0.001	-0.011	-0.001	-0.025	-0.007	0.009
wp rew. grade	-0.002	0.011	-0.003	0.011	-0.003	0.002
wp teams	0.034**	-0.023	0.012**	-0.004	-0.007	0.017

Table 2. Probability of perceived availability of family friendly practices, continued.

	parent leave (1)	paid leave (2)	child care (3)	flexi time (4)	home work (5)	job share (6)
wp circles	0.007	0.012	-0.001	0.041	-0.002	0.006
wp lot disc	0.024	-0.029	0.015**	0.052**	0.013*	0.005
wp some disc	0.018	-0.010	0.008**	0.034**	0.006	0.006
wp union recognition	0.051**	0.024	-0.001	0.047**	-0.000	0.041**
wp grievance proc	0.022	-0.011	0.001	0.034**	0.002	-0.003
wp hr rep	0.017	0.069**	0.014**	0.019	0.007	0.004
wp employment change	-0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	0.000	0.000
wp dismissals	-0.017	-0.640**	0.068*	-0.142	-0.149*	0.112
wp resignations	-0.011	-0.106**	-0.051**	0.074	0.029*	-0.044
wp dif. vacancies	-0.027	0.031	0.000	-0.010	-0.012	-0.012
manufacturing	-0.027	-0.067*	-0.017**	-0.051	0.001	-0.087**
electrical	-0.000	0.108**	0.003	0.124*	0.059**	-0.032
construction	0.006	-0.136**	-0.010	-0.010	0.010	-0.016
wholesale	-0.006	-0.037	-0.016**	-0.021	-0.023**	-0.050**
hotels	-0.054	-0.088**	0.005	0.012	0.006	-0.014
transport	0.027	-0.059	-0.013**	0.011	0.026	-0.049**
finance	-0.020	-0.085**	-0.013**	0.081	0.012	-0.027
other business	0.017	-0.041	-0.007	0.038	0.026*	-0.037*
public	0.024	0.019	-0.002	0.242**	0.020	0.057**
education	-0.040	-0.234**	-0.004	-0.179**	-0.022**	-0.048**
health	-0.069**	0.020	-0.006	-0.026	-0.017	-0.031*
constant	**	**	**	**	**	**
industry joint F test	**	**	**	**	**	**
occupation joint F test	**	**	*	**	**	**
number of obs	20344	20344	20344	20344	20344	20344
number of strata	70	70	70	70	70	70
number of PSUs	1492	1492	1492	1492	1492	1492
model F test	14.540**	21.463**	16.532**	10.204**	22.157**	13.802**
Pseudo R2	0.0803	0.1328	0.2131	0.0894	0.2779	0.1659
Dependent variable mean	0.267	0.452	0.036	0.311	0.09	0.147

Source: Workplace Employee Relations Survey, 1998. Each entry contains the marginal effect (or differential effect in the case of a binary variable) weighted by individual sampling weights. The point estimates and standard errors account for the stratification and clustering in the sampling procedure. * significant at 90%,** significant at 95%.

Table 3. Probability of actual availability of family friendly practices.

	parent leave	paid leave	child care	home work	job share
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
individual variables					
single parent child 0-4	-0.038	0.000	0.004	0.033	0.015
single parent child 5-11	-0.019	0.032	-0.012	0.058**	0.083**
single parent child 12-18	0.011	-0.038	-0.016	0.014	0.000
single no children	-0.021	0.003	0.015**	0.004	0.002
married no children	-0.021*	-0.027**	0.006	0.019**	0.002
age	0.005	0.003	-0.000	0.004	0.000
age2	-0.077	-0.021	0.001	-0.035	0.006
female	0.005	-0.002	0.006	-0.000	0.004
ethnic	0.002	0.026	-0.007	0.009	0.032
hourly wage	0.000	-0.000	0.000	-0.001*	-0.002*
hours	0.002	0.007**	0.002**	0.002	0.003
hours squared	-0.000	-0.000**	-0.000**	-0.000	-0.000*
tenure	0.000	0.003	0.001	-0.001	0.002
training	0.004**	0.004*	0.001	0.002	0.004**
part-time	-0.017	0.026	0.012	-0.006	-0.016
fixed term	0.027	0.031	0.024**	0.008	0.032
temporary	-0.004	-0.016	-0.010	0.036	0.017
union member	0.045**	0.026	-0.012**	-0.016	0.038*
education other	0.000	-0.047**	0.003	-0.006	-0.049**
cse	-0.024	-0.028	-0.005	0.013*	-0.032*
alevel	-0.013	0.011	-0.003	0.016*	-0.005
degree	-0.001	0.036*	0.004	0.017	0.033*
post graduate	0.081**	0.067**	0.019	0.054**	0.105**
vocational qualification	0.002	-0.007	0.013**	0.004	-0.010
managers	-0.016	-0.036	-0.000	0.046*	-0.033
profs	-0.048	-0.030	0.013	0.041	-0.071*
assoc prof	0.039	0.042	0.013	0.031	-0.024
clerk	0.013	0.020	0.020	0.046	-0.034
craft	-0.064	-0.012	-0.008	-0.011	-0.081**
personal	-0.041	-0.060	-0.003	-0.035	-0.068*
sales	0.058	0.021	-0.025	-0.014	-0.075
operative	-0.066	-0.079**	-0.001	-0.007	-0.117**
workplace variables					
wp size	0.056*	-0.055**	0.018**	0.032*	0.020
wp age	0.686*	-0.262	0.095	-0.085	0.191
wp multi-enterprise	0.094**	0.032	-0.018	-0.023	0.137**
wp training	0.110**	0.180**	0.014	0.041	0.132**
wp ppn female	0.164	-0.223**	0.065*	0.289**	0.626**
wp ppn part time	0.067	-0.241**	-0.048	-0.133**	-0.106
wp ppn youth	-0.239	-0.089	-0.027	-0.035	-0.233
wp ppn old	-0.286*	-0.201	-0.040	-0.105	0.031
wp ppn ethnic	0.125	-0.120	0.105*	0.075	0.136
wp ave wage	0.010	-0.006	0.002	0.016**	0.013
wp rew. seniority	-0.025	0.053	0.013	-0.013**	0.026
wp rew. grade	0.028	0.039	0.020	0.018	0.094**

Table 3. Probability of actual availability of family friendly practices, continued.

	parent leave (1)	paid leave (2)	child care (3)	home work (4)	job share (5)
wp teams	0.098*	-0.021	0.071**	-0.008	0.078
wp circles	0.082	-0.015	0.043**	0.071**	0.153**
wp lot disc	0.001	-0.141**	-0.015	0.011	-0.052
wp some disc	0.011	-0.042	-0.001	-0.019	-0.039
wp union recognition	0.130**	0.030	0.027	-0.021	0.112**
wp grievance proc	0.099**	0.005	-0.004	-0.004	0.095**
wp hr rep	0.062	0.100**	0.047**	0.061**	0.202**
wp employment change	0.000	0.000	-0.000	0.000**	0.000
wp dismissals	-0.085	-0.776	0.021	-0.689	-0.218
wp resignations	0.067	-0.136	-0.101*	-0.168*	0.020
wp dif. vacancies	0.047	0.017	0.039*	0.010	0.004
manufacturing	-0.257**	-0.035	-0.072**	-0.066	-0.354**
electrical	-0.157	0.036	0.121**	-0.009	-0.125
construction	-0.124	-0.143	-0.032	-0.106**	-0.053
wholesale	-0.111	-0.061	-0.062**	-0.065	-0.228**
hotels	-0.265**	0.046	0.021	-0.106**	-0.165*
transport	0.049	-0.034	-0.006	-0.023	-0.001
finance	-0.240**	-0.075	-0.052**	-0.085*	-0.192**
other business	-0.171*	0.067	-0.036	-0.058	-0.164**
public	-0.125	0.108	-0.027	-0.033	0.010
education	-0.181**	0.246**	-0.020	-0.089**	-0.237**
health	-0.226**	0.249**	-0.002	-0.100**	-0.162**
constant	**	**	**	**	**
industry joint F test	**	**	**		**
occupation joint F test	**	**		*	*
number of obs	20344	20344	20344	20344	20344
number of strata	70	70	70	70	70
number of PSU	1492	1492	1492	1492	1492
model F test	4.098**	3.756**	5.391**	3.633**	6.381**
Pseudo R2	0.1683	0.1367	0.2776	0.1765	0.3138
Dependent variable mean	0.413	0.614	0.115	0.172	0.371

Source: Workplace Employee Relations Survey, 1998. Each entry contains the marginal effect (or differential effect in the case of a binary variable) weighted by individual sampling weights. The point estimates and standard errors account for the stratification and clustering in the sampling procedure. * significant at 90%,** significant at 95%.

Table 4. Probability of awareness of the availability of a family friendly practice.

	parent leave	paid leave	child care	home work	job share
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
individual variables					
single parent child 0-4	0.033	-0.033	0.175	-0.053	-0.068
single parent child 5-11	0.026	-0.095**	0.201**	0.035	-0.048
single parent child 12-18	0.026	0.010	-0.074	-0.013	-0.056
single no children	-0.074**	-0.003	-0.013	-0.024	0.002
married no children	-0.042**	0.016	-0.057**	-0.014	-0.015
age	0.010*	0.011**	-0.002	0.001	0.001
age2	-0.194**	-0.152**	0.004	0.027	-0.030
female	0.047**	-0.020	0.094**	-0.003	0.080**
ethnic	-0.124**	-0.018	-0.083	-0.008	-0.017
hourly wage	0.003	0.002	0.004**	0.006**	0.002
hours	0.005	0.017**	0.007	0.013**	0.009**
hours squared	-0.000*	-0.000**	-0.000	-0.000**	-0.000**
tenure	0.004*	0.005**	0.005*	-0.000	0.006**
training	0.006**	0.001	-0.002	0.005**	0.011**
part-time	-0.056	-0.031	0.027	0.070	0.042
fixed term	-0.027	-0.100**	-0.020	-0.008	-0.046
temporary	-0.050	-0.216**	0.078	-0.028	0.027
union member	0.016	0.026	0.025	-0.038**	0.027*
education other	-0.091**	0.026	-0.014	-0.067**	-0.082**
cse	-0.070**	-0.001	0.087	-0.010	-0.054**
alevel	0.024	0.044**	0.013	0.043**	0.009
degree	0.014	-0.010	0.012	0.067**	0.041*
post graduate	0.102**	-0.024	0.024	0.117**	0.052**
vocational qualification	-0.007	-0.015	0.005	-0.026*	-0.024
managers	0.132**	-0.003	0.280**	0.461**	0.233**
profs	0.032	-0.045	0.229**	0.332**	0.155**
assoc prof	0.027	-0.052	0.209**	0.286**	0.088**
clerk	0.037	0.084**	0.239**	0.155**	0.221**
craft	-0.006	0.067*	0.002	-0.013	0.005
personal	0.064	-0.002	0.114	0.064	0.051
sales	0.087*	-0.036	0.198	0.428**	0.015
operative	0.032	-0.010	0.057	-0.017	0.120**
workplace variables					
wp size	-0.008	0.031**	0.003	-0.021**	-0.007
wp age	-0.103	0.089	-0.057	-1.161**	-0.027
wp multi-enterprise	0.046*	0.018	-0.100**	-0.033	-0.020
wp training	-0.002	-0.001	-0.024	0.023	0.008
wp ppn female	0.153**	0.080*	-0.025	-0.035	0.142**
wp ppn part time	0.040	-0.110*	0.133	-0.046	0.027
wp ppn youth	-0.145	-0.318**	-0.691	-0.202	0.122
wp ppn old	-0.157*	0.166**	-0.440**	-0.025	-0.133
wp ppn ethnic	0.214**	-0.037	0.360**	0.057	-0.004
wp ave wage	-0.003	0.008*	-0.000	0.000	0.008
wp rew. seniority	-0.016	-0.020	0.035	-0.015	0.005
wp rew. grade	-0.007	-0.013	-0.064**	-0.022	-0.004

Table 4. Probability of awareness of the availability of a family friendly practice, continued

	parent leave (1)	paid leave (2)	child care (3)	home work (4)	job share (5)
wp teams	0.009	-0.006	0.049	-0.063**	0.026
wp circles	-0.005	0.018	-0.126**	-0.004	-0.021
wp lot disc	0.014	0.030	0.153**	0.038	-0.002
wp some disc	0.021	-0.038*	0.163**	0.009	0.014
wp union recognition	0.052*	0.014	-0.013	0.005	0.070**
wp grievance proc	-0.012	-0.004	-0.055	0.005	-0.018
wp hr rep	0.037*	0.054**	0.032	-0.007	-0.019
wp employment change	-0.000**	0.000	-0.000	0.000**	0.000
wp dismissals	0.363	-0.545	1.507	-0.814	-0.638
wp resignations	-0.049	-0.126**	-0.446**	0.066	-0.121
wp dif. vacancies	-0.008	0.029	-0.019	-0.073**	-0.054*
manufacturing	0.041	-0.013	0.011	-0.022	-0.070
electrical	0.011	0.187**	-0.034	0.039	-0.074*
construction	-0.020	-0.112*	-0.079	0.014	0.058
wholesale	0.000	0.002	-0.128**	-0.039	-0.015
hotels	-0.122*	-0.044	0.348**	-0.001	0.002
transport	0.051	-0.023	-0.103*	0.043	-0.085
finance	-0.010	-0.052	-0.015	-0.031	-0.032
other business	0.106**	-0.006	0.005	0.016	-0.026
public	0.047	0.058	0.028	0.010	0.083*
education	-0.002	-0.257**	-0.076	-0.037	-0.056
health	-0.066	-0.014	-0.059	-0.023	-0.009
constant	**	**	**	**	**
industry joint F test	**	**	**		**
occupation joint F test	**	**	**	**	**
model F test	13.227**	16.091**	9.329**	8.718**	7.134**
number of obs	8771	13365	2500	3740	8178
number of strata	70	70	70	70	70
number of PSU	633	949	175	253	568
Pseudo R2	0.0717	0.1106	0.1899	0.3092	0.1284
Dependent variable mean	0.349	0.521	0.209	0.212	0.265

Source: Workplace Employee Relations Survey, 1998. Each entry contains the marginal effect (or differential effect in the case of a binary variable) weighted by individual sampling weights. The point estimates and standard errors account for the stratification and clustering in the sampling procedure. * significant at 90%,** significant at 95%.

Table 5. The impact of a human resources representative or of union recognition on the awareness of family friendly practices.

	parent leave (1)	paid leave (2)	child care (3)	home work (4)	job share (5)
wp human resources rep					
(1) probability of actual availability at the workplace	0.160# [0.062] (0.100)	0.266** [0.100] (0.100)	0.404** [0.047] (0.131)	0.291** [0.061] (0.117)	0.574** [0.202] (0.111)
(2) probability of awareness	0.101* [0.037] (0.055)	0.135** [0.054] (0.047)	0.142 [0.032] (0.191)	-0.034 [-0.007] (0.108)	-0.061 [-0.019] (0.066)
(3) correctly aware	0.144** [0.027] (0.071)	0.249** [0.085] (0.065)	0.544** [0.006] (0.154)	0.199* [0.003] (0.103)	0.251** [0.022] (0.073)
(4) unaware	0.137* [0.043] (0.076)	0.033 [0.011] (0.062)	0.039** [0.034] (0.123)	0.278** [0.050] (0.112)	0.475** [0.143] (0.089)
wp union recognition					
(5) probability of actual availability at the workplace	0.344** [0.130] (0.118)	0.078 [0.030] (0.125)	0.248# [0.027] (0.168)	-0.102 [-0.021] (0.142)	0.325** [0.112] (0.128)
(6) probability of awareness	0.146* [0.052] (0.083)	0.035 [0.014] (0.064)	-0.053 [-0.013] (0.231)	0.025 [0.005] (0.154)	0.242** [0.070] (0.114)
(7) correctly aware	0.303** [0.054] (0.947)	0.073 [0.025] (0.082)	0.336* [0.003] (0.193)	0.040 [0.001] (0.126)	0.388** [0.031] (0.107)
(8) unaware	0.216** [0.067] (0.097)	-0.003 [-0.001] (0.087)	0.196 [0.018] (0.160)	-0.126 [-0.022] (0.140)	0.168# [0.049] (0.107)

Source: Workplace Employee Relations Survey, 1998. Each entry contains the probit coefficient, marginal effects [in square brackets] and standard errors (in round brackets) from the probit models. The probit models are weighted by individual sampling weights. The point estimates and standard errors account for the stratification and clustering (when relevant) in the sampling procedure. # significant at 85%, * significant at 90%,** significant at 95%.